

## **REMARKS**

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested. Specifically, favorable consideration of pending Claims 1-65 is respectfully requested.

### **THE REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a)**

Claims 1-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxena et al. (U.S. Patent 6,259,449; hereafter “Saxena”). The Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection as well, and further requests that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Saxena describes an integrated communication center having two interface screens. The first interface screen has display areas for information regarding files and messages sent and received by a computer (Saxena, col. 1, lines 49-52). The second interface screen includes information relating to the status of data files or messages sent or received by the computer, or information relating to the identity of remote devices accessible by the computer over a network or phone connection (Saxena, col. 1, lines 57-61). In other words, the first interface screen shows information regarding transmissions performed by a computer, and the second interface shows information regarding transmissions between the computer and a remote device or information regarding the identification of a remote device that interacts with the computer.

Accordingly, with regard to independent Claim 1, the rejection rightly states that, “Saxena does not specifically teach ‘at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing

device’.” Rather, according to Saxena, the second interface is always associated with a transaction in association with the first computing device. For instance, Saxena describes one embodiment in which, “a unified graphical user interface program integrates various communication applications available on host computer 102,” (Saxena, col. 4, lines 17-19; emphasis added). Saxena further describes, “Display section 416 provides graphical display of the status of outgoing and pending telephone calls and e-mail transmissions from the integrated communication center,” (Saxena, col. 9, lines 3-5; emphasis added).

Thus, Saxena describes an integrated communication center having two interface screens, wherein each interface screen displays information or data regarding processing affiliated with the integrated communication center. Accordingly, it would contradict the description provided by Saxena to have a “at least one identifier that identifies that said second GUI is not associated with said first computing device,” as in Claim 1. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, it is respectfully submitted that independent **Claim 1** and corresponding dependent **Claims 2-12** are not obvious over Saxena.

For similar reasons set forth above with regard to Claims 1-12, the Applicant respectfully submits that the remainder of pending Claims 13-65 is distinguishable over Saxena, particularly in view of the fact that the rejection makes acknowledgements similar to that in relation to Claim 1, shown as:

- regarding independent **Claim 13** and corresponding dependent **Claims 14 and 15**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach “GUI data that includes data for displaying at least one

identifier that identifies that said GUI data is associated with said computing device.”

- regarding independent **Claim 16** and dependent **Claims 17-21**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach, “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device.”
- regarding independent **Claim 22** and dependent **Claims 23 and 24**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach, “generating said GUI data to include data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI is associated with said computing device.”
- regarding independent **Claim 25** and dependent **Claims 26-36**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach, “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first computing device.”
- regarding independent **Claim 37** and dependent **Claims 38 and 39**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach, “data for displaying at least one identifier that identifies that said GUI is associated with said computing device.”
- regarding independent **Claim 40** and dependent **Claims 41-52**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach, “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first program.”

- regarding independent **Claim 53** and dependent **Claims 54-65**, the rejection acknowledges that Saxena does not teach, “at least one identifier that identifies that the second GUI is not associated with said first program.”

More specifically, Claims 13-65 are distinguishable over Saxena, which describes an integrated communication center having two interface screens, with both interface screens displaying information or data regarding processing affiliated with the integrated communication center. Therefore, for reasons substantially similar to those set forth above regarding Claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that Saxena does not render Claims 1-65 obvious. Thus the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be reconsidered and withdrawn.

### CONCLUSION


The remaining references of record have been considered. It is respectfully submitted that they do not compensate for the deficiencies of any of the references utilized in rejecting the pending claims.

All objections and rejections having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is now in condition for allowance. Early and forthright issuance of a Notice of Allowability is respectfully requested.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC

Dated: July 12, 2004

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
David S. Lee  
Reg. No. 38,222  
(206) 315-4001